

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

1991

The re-emergence of public support for rehabilitative treatment in prisons

Victoria Lynn Penley

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project>



Part of the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Penley, Victoria Lynn, "The re-emergence of public support for rehabilitative treatment in prisons" (1991). *Theses Digitization Project*. 851.
<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/851>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

THE RE-EMERGENCE OF PUBLIC SUPPORT
FOR REHABILITATIVE TREATMENT IN PRISONS:
Public opinion of punishment and rehabilitation
as a primary function of correctional institutions

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts
in
Criminal Justice

by
Victoria Lynn Penley
June 1991

THE RE-EMERGENCE OF PUBLIC SUPPORT
FOR REHABILITATIVE TREATMENT IN PRISONS:
Public opinion of punishment and rehabilitation
as a primary function of correctional institutions

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

by
Victoria Lynn Penley
June 1991

Approved by:



Dr. Frank Williams, Chair, Criminal Justice

6-12-91

Date



Dr. Marilyn McShane, Committee Chair



Dr. Dale Sechrest

ABSTRACT

In recent years, public opinion polls about the treatment of offenders in prison have demonstrated an heuristic phenomenon: in the midst of the "get tough" movement, the public has strongly supported rehabilitation. The present study adds to the body of research that has revealed similar findings. This study analyzes the 1988 Texas Crime Survey, conducted on a random sample of 2000 Texas drivers. There were 1182 usable questionnaires. Variables analyzed included the purposes of prisons as either rehabilitation or punishment and concern about crime. A scale of zero to ten was used to rate the importance of each item. For data analysis, the scaled items and demographic characteristics were used both as raw items and as recoded, collapsed categories. The quality of the measurement of data approximated interval level due to the type of scale used in the survey. This allowed the use of sensitive statistics for analysis. Findings revealed that punishment received 83.2 percent support and rehabilitation received 69.9 percent, overall. Analysis confirmed several hypotheses: levels of support for rehabilitation and punishment were significantly different; support for punishment was greater than for rehabilitation, revealing a punitive sample. Several hypotheses were not supported: rehabilitation and punishment were not significantly correlated; when collapsed by thirds, the means for the categories of rehabilitation and punishment were not meaningfully different, (at least three points difference), and the categories were not mutually exclusive. An unexpected finding was that responses on the collapsed scales tended to group together. It was concluded that this sample is more punitive than rehabilitative, yet the sample is strongly reformative at the same time.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To all my professors

Especially Dr. Frank Williams, Dr. Marilyn McShane,
Dr. Dale Sechrest and Dr. Carl Wagoner
for tremendous patience, guidance and instruction

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Public Opinion Defined	2
1. Public Expression of Opinions	2
2. Public Opinion Formation	3
3. The Importance of Public Opinion	6
B. Definition of Concepts	8
C. Statement of the Problem	8
D. Purpose of the Present Study	8
1. Data and Sample	9
E. Statement of Hypotheses	9
II. CONCERN ABOUT CRIME AND PUBLIC	
OPINION FORMATION	12
A. Concern About Crime	12
B. The Breakdown of the	
Rehabilitative Model	14
1. The Rise of "Just Deserts"	17
2. The Crisis in Corrections	19
C. The Re-emergence of Support for	
Rehabilitation	21
1. Correctional Support for	
Rehabilitation	24
2. Pluralistic Ignorance	25
D. Summary	26
III. METHODOLOGY	29
1. Sample	29
2. Independent Variables	29
3. Dependent Variables	30

	4. Limitations of the Study	31
IV. ANALYSIS		33
	1. Sample Characteristics	33
	2. Distribution of Public Opinion Variables	33
	3. Hypotheses	36
	4. Demographic Variables	42
	5. Concern About Crime as an Exogenous Variable	45
V. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS		49
	1. Status Variables	50
	2. Concern About Crime	50
	3. Rehabilitation or Punishment	51
BIBLIOGRAPHY		58

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Frequency Distributions for Demographic Characteristics in Percentages	34
2. Frequencies, Percentages, Means, Medians, and Modes for Raw Scales (0-10) of Support for Rehabilitation and Punishment as the Purpose of Prisons	35
3. Frequencies, Percentages, Means, Medians, and Modes for Support of Rehabilitation and Punishment on the Collapsed Scale by Thirds and Halves . .	37
4. Independent Random Groups, Paired Samples t-tests, and Correlations for Rehabilitation and Punishment Scales	38
5. Crosstabulation of Support for Rehabilitation by Punishment Collapsed by Thirds	40
6. Crosstabulation of Support for Rehabilitation by Punishment Collapsed by Halves	41
7. Rehabilitation and Punishment by Demographic Characteristics Collapsed by Thirds	43
8. Concern About Crime Raw and Collapsed Scales Frequencies	46
9. Crosstabulation of Concern About Crime by Rehabilitation and Punishment Collapsed Categories by Thirds	47

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This chapter will define public opinion and opinion formation. The importance of considering public opinion when forming criminal justice policies is discussed. The data and sample used in this study is outlined and hypotheses are presented.

In recent public opinion polls, it has been demonstrated that rehabilitation as the purpose of prisons and criminal sanctioning has been gaining favor. (Stinchcombe, Adams, Heimer, Scheppele, Smith & Taylor, 1980; Gottfredson & Taylor, 1984; Cullen, Clark, Cullen & Mathers, 1985; Cullen, Clark & Wozniak, 1985; Thomson & Ragona, 1987; Cullen, Cullen & Wozniak, 1988). Recent polls have also revealed that "just deserts" and "get-tough" alternatives have stabilized at high levels of support. (Halleck & Witte, 1977; Stinchcombe, Adams, Heimer, Scheppele, Smith, & Taylor, 1980; Allen, 1981; Warr & Stafford, 1984; Rogers, 1989). The heuristic discovery that the public has endorsed both apparently conflicting ideologies has been the focus of much research. The present research question is concerned with why there is a rise in support for reformatory measures in the climate of the "get tough" movement. The public continues to endorse the practice of incarceration as a punitive measure. But since it has been found that the public also favors rehabilitative measures for those who have been incarcerated, prison policies and programs should be adjusted to accommodate and incorporate these changes in public desires. The value of public opinion research on prison policy, including the present study, is that it gathers information that policymakers and prison administrators could use. Because

public sentiments affect the successful implementation of prison programs, and public support of the prison system is needed to maintain it, prison administrators and policymakers should be aware of any changes in public expectations and desires. There should be some degree of public consensus and agreement with policies and the types of programs offered in prisons if the public is expected to support them. The present study adds to the research of public opinion concerning prison policy and programs.

Public Opinion Defined

For the purpose of this study, "public opinion" means that each person's response is counted as one "vote," and then all responses are added together. Converse (1987:S15) explains the Populist view which describes public opinion as many persons' votes, whereas one person's voice equals one vote. As is characteristic in a democratic society, each voice, or response counted, is "equally weighted." (Back, 1988:281). This view is considered to be the democratic definition of public opinion.

Our language is replete with words that describe public opinion. Back (1988:281) examined metaphors used that illustrate the concept, such as the chorus, voices of the gods, and the Greek polis. These common words describe collections of joint expression.

Public opinion is a product of a society's structure. The structure of American society is democratically and individually oriented. The survey method of public opinion research measures individual responses in order to determine trends in social attitudes. This method reflects the individualistic, democratic values of our society, which may contribute to the survey method's popularity. (Back, 1988:278).

Public Expression of Opinions

Even though individuals hold their particular views,

and for purposes of opinion research, each is considered equal, expressing them is another matter. According to Noelle-Neuman's (1977) "spiral of silence" theory, the way people perceive others' opinions, influences if and how they express their own views. (In Glynn & McLeod, 1984:731). Their willingness to express political views is determined by how they perceive others' views. When people believe that others favor their beliefs, they are more willing to express their own. Conversely, if people think that others would not share their feelings, they are less likely to express their views and are more likely to remain silent. Therefore, when anyone expresses their views, that expression changes the "global environment of opinion," altering the perception of other persons and affecting their willingness to express their own opinion. The "spiraling process" is established by people's tendency to express their opinion or remain quiet. The expression of opinion builds and creates a "spiral" effect. As people perceive that their opinion is becoming more important to others, they have the tendency to speak up. This increases the impression that one opinion is the most prevalent. Glynn and McLeod (1984:732) conducted an opinion analysis of voters to assess the "spiral of silence" theory. The study examined the expression of voter opinion twice before and once after a major election. Respondents were significantly more reserved when asked to discuss the candidate of their choice when they perceived that their position was losing support. They were more willing to discuss their candidate when they believed that their choice was gaining favor. It was concluded that those who see their position as gaining favor are more likely to express their views.

Public Opinion Formation

Why do people think what they do? What influences the views they hold? It has been found that environmental

factors play a role in influencing public opinion. Stinchcombe (1980) tested Converse's cognitive consistency theory as applied to public opinion. The theory states that as "issues become salient," people "develop coherent ideologies" that are "consistent with one's world view." When issues become important, consideration and concern of them "accelerates." People are inclined to think more about them, and in accordance to their general belief systems. People develop attitudes that are consistent with other beliefs they hold. People become stronger in their positions, such as liberal or conservative. (Stinchcombe et al., 1980:14). Stinchcombe conducted a survey to assess the strength of punitive attitudes and to examine whether respondents' attitudes toward criminal sanctions are an effect of personal salience, (i.e., victimization experience or crime causal attribution), or more of "social (public) salience." Stinchcombe explains that "social salience" is the effect of "environmental cues," (such as media, public addresses, and public leaders), upon people's judgments and opinions. (1980:127-128). Stinchcombe hypothesized that if cognitive consistency is affected more by personal salience, intercorrelations between victimization and punitive attitudes should be stronger for those who have been victimized. This was not found to be the case. In fact, some of those surveyed who had been victimized, expressed considerably lower measures of punitiveness than those who had not been victimized. It was concluded that people based their judgments more upon environmental cues than personal cues, and that punitive attitudes were an effect of social (public) salience. Therefore, media, as an environmental cue, plays a role in influencing public opinion.

Since public opinion concerning criminal sanctions have changed since the 1960's, and media is thought to influence changes, (Allen, 1981, Glynn & McLeod, 1984, Robinson &

Levy, 1986) it is beneficial to examine changes that have occurred in news reporting of crime. It may be that the frequency of crime news reports has had an influence upon public concern for crime. Humphries (1981:195) examined newspaper crime stories in the New York Post. The Post was considered to be representative of the type of news reporting in other metropolitan areas in the country. Humphries compared stories in the years 1951 and 1968, and found that there was an increase in stories about deadly violence from 1951 to 1968, and that the "frequency of lethal violence was exaggerated" for stories in 1968. Media attention to crimes of violence had increased. It could be that news crime reports had increased and had been exaggerated during that period. It may also be that frequency of news crime reports influenced the rise in public concern for crime. However, it is difficult to empirically demonstrate the extent to which crime reporting effects opinion formation. From this evidence, it cannot be known which came first, public concern for crime or media attention to it.

The reception of media information is not the only variable that may affect opinion formation. News exposure alone is not enough to account for public opinion. Another variable is the discussion of news items with others. Discussion is thought to increase news comprehension. This is the finding of Robinson and Levy (1986) in their study, "Interpersonal communication and news comprehension." They conducted phone interviews with residents in Washington, D.C., and with residents in a national sample. Respondents were asked if they had been exposed to any news the previous week, and if they had discussed the item with anyone. Respondents were then asked to recall what they had learned from the news item. It was found that 68 percent of the Washington, D.C. sample and 62 percent of the national

sample remembered any news item accurately. Less than one-third of respondents retained the main point. Those who had discussed the item with a friend, colleague or family member retained significantly more correct information than those who did not. It was concluded that discussion of news items has as much influence as a predictor of comprehension as exposure to news.

Another factor that has been found to influence public opinion formation is group identification or group membership. The strength of people's opinions is determined not so much "where they stand" on an issue, but "with whom they stand." (Price, 1989:198). Price (1989) surveyed undergraduate students to examine how phony news reports of a proposal to increase core requirements at a university influenced students' opinions. It was found that when the phony news article emphasized conflict of opinion between groups of students, greater salience of group membership identification seems to have been "triggered." Opinions for or against the increases of requirements were strongest when news items were presented in a group conflict context and when personal cost was higher. Group identification and the way in which news items are presented appear to have an impact upon opinion. Whatever group a person relates to and identifies with has been shown to have an impact on his or her opinions. Group identification can take many forms, whether it be by ethnicity, age, sex, income or education level, or various other group characteristics.

The Importance of Public Opinion

There are a number of scholars who believe that the public does not understand criminal theory and sanctions sufficiently to make reasonable choices about them. Flanagan (1987:231-232) points out that this line of thinking "may be a serious mistake." Even though lay perceptions may not contribute to criminological research,

he maintains that public opinion is a necessary input for crime control policy considerations. Further, he states that criminologists sometimes consider lay perceptions to be "simplistic, ill-informed and irrelevant...consequently, lay perceptions have been ignored for the most part." Some criminologists believe that the public is ignorant of the complexity of criminal behavior, and unaware of the problems of crime control. Flanagan's advice is that no matter how accurate public beliefs are, they continue to influence crime control policy, and should not be ignored. Today, crime and criminal procedures are "in the forefront of public attention." Our common language is replete with words and phrases that reflect various crime control ideologies and theories. Some examples are: 'pay one's debt to society', 'give him what he deserves', or 'just deserts' as in the case of retribution or punishment; 'protect society' or 'get him off the streets', as in the case of incapacitation'. (Warr & Stafford, 1984:96). For scholars who consider public opinion to be valuable and worthy of study, Stinchcombe (1980:2-3) asserts that public opinion polls and the survey are still the best and most useful methods to tap public opinion.

Some critics of social research hold that the systematic study of changes in social attitudes and policy is not reliable. Sufficient isolation of an independent variable and control of extraneous variables is difficult if not impossible in social research designs. But McGuigan (1983:269) contends that "society is replete with examples in which some research was better than none..." and that some situations "demand solution", even if high standards of laboratory experimentation are not used. McGuigan maintains that "society is often in a position to systematically evaluate changes and thus to gradually develop more beneficial practices." The survey method may be the most

useful in studying changes in social attitudes that can aid in developing social policy.

The sample survey method, (as opposed to population survey), which is utilized to study the public, is the most practical way to obtain information about public opinion. In most instances, it is impossible to survey an entire population due to limitations of time and money. Moreover, findings from a study of a survey sample may be more accurate and effective. The response rate, respondents' cooperation in answering questions, and the efficient use of resources is greater when a sample method is used. (Bailey, 1987:84).

Definition of Concepts

The present study will assess public opinion about the purposes of prison. The purposes that will be examined are rehabilitation and punishment. What is meant by rehabilitation is the treatment of offenders with programs that help equip them for life in their communities once they are paroled. Punishment is defined as simply making the offender pay for his/her harm done to society.

Statement of the Problem

The present study will analyze and evaluate public opinion on what the most important purpose of prisons should be. This includes whether prisons should be institutions of punishment or rehabilitation. The decline of rehabilitation as the primary purpose of prison, the rise of "just deserts", and factors that are related to those ideals are discussed.

Purpose of the Present Study

The purpose of this study is to examine public opinion about the purposes of prisons. This study will assess whether public opinion supports treatment/rehabilitative measures or punishment as the most important function of prisons. This study will examine respondent characteristics

and concern about crime variables with ratings of support for rehabilitation and punishment in prisons. The category of those who support rehabilitation will be compared to the category of those who support punishment to assess whether they are statistically different. Significant differences between the two groups will be further analyzed for meaningfulness. That is, the distance between variable measures will be evaluated for its meaningfulness. A meaningful distance between the means for support of rehabilitation and punishment should be at least three points. The findings from this analysis should be valuable because of the generalizability of the sample. The results of this study should be useful to policymakers and prison administrators who understand the importance of public opinion and the necessity of public consensus concerning the operations and policies of prisons. The information from this study can be used to adjust prison policy and programs to accommodate any major changes in public desires.

Data and Sample

To examine these hypotheses, data are used from the Texas Crime Survey (1988). This data set is a sample of adult Texas residents. Surveys have revealed that Texas is found to be among the most punitive of "law and order" states. (Cullen, Clark, & Wozniak, 1985). Therefore, if rehabilitative purposes are found to have support in the present Texas sample, then it might be expected that other punitive as well as less punitive states would also support rehabilitative purposes. The generalizability of this sample should be valuable. It is expected that this sample will favor both rehabilitative and punitive purposes for prisons.

Statement of Hypotheses

The present study proposes that those respondents who strongly support punishment as the most important goal of

prisons will not strongly support rehabilitation. Further, those who strongly support rehabilitation will not also strongly support punishment. It is proposed that public support for either punishment or rehabilitation as the most important purpose for prison is mutually exclusive as an opinion.

Hypothesis 1.

Support for rehabilitation will be negatively correlated with support for punishment.

Hypothesis 2.

The means for the categories of support for rehabilitation and support for punishment will be significantly different.

Hypothesis 3.

The means of the categories will be meaningfully different. At least three points distance between the means is established as a meaningful distance.

This study proposes that the analysis of the opinion poll will reveal that the sample is more punitive than rehabilitative.

Hypothesis 4.

The mean for the category of support for punishment will be significantly higher than the mean for rehabilitation.

Hypothesis 5.

The mean for punishment will be meaningfully higher than the mean for rehabilitation.

Hypothesis 6.

When the scales for punishment and rehabilitation are collapsed into thirds, the groups will tend to be at opposite ends (i.e., low-high, high-low) or together in the middle (medium-medium).

Hypothesis 7.

When the scales are collapsed by thirds, the low-high,

high-low and medium-medium combined groupings will represent more than 50 percent of all cases. Therefore, it is expected that the number of cases in the remaining six categories will represent 50 percent or less of the total number of cases.

Hypothesis 8.

When the scales for punishment and rehabilitation are collapsed into halves, the groups will tend to be at opposite ends (i.e., low-high, high-low).

Hypothesis 9.

When the scales are collapsed by halves, the low-high, high-low groupings combined will represent more than 50 percent of all cases. It is expected that the remaining two categories will represent less than 50 percent of all cases.

CHAPTER 2

CONCERN ABOUT CRIME AND PUBLIC OPINION FORMATION

Introduction

This chapter will discuss the breakdown of the rehabilitative model and the rise of the "just deserts" ideology. The crisis in corrections, the re-emergence of support for rehabilitation in the public and in corrections will be presented. This chapter will discuss public concern about crime and the possible effects that victimization, the media, and public leaders may have upon punitive attitudes toward law-breakers.

Concern About Crime

A social-psychological factor that has been considered partially responsible for the "decline" of support for rehabilitation in prisons is concern about crime. Concern for crime has been thought to be linked to the rise in punitive attitudes toward law-breakers. "Pragmatist theory" states that the greater a person's fear of crime, or the more they have been victimized, the more it would seem that they would advocate harsh penalties for offenders. But Stinchcombe (1980) and his associates found evidence to the contrary. The concern, or fear of crime was not statistically intercorrelated with punitive attitudes. He found that women were more afraid, less victimized, but were less punitive. Men were less afraid, but were more punitive and more often victimized. Blacks, who are more often victimized, were less punitive. Fear of crime probably has more to do with public salience. It seems to play the strongest role in influencing public opinion. Public (social) salience, or "environmental cues," such as media attention, public addresses and public leaders, when added

to personal experiences of victimization, have more to do with shaping individuals' opinions than personal experience alone. (Stinchcombe, et al., 1980:72,130, Scheingold, 1984:48,50). Thus, the rise in punitive public attitudes in the 1970's probably had more to do with "environmental cues" such as media information, the influence of public leaders and group identification than with personal salience alone. (Stinchcombe, 1980:72,130, Scheingold, 1984:48, 50, Price, 1989:198).

Scheingold (1984:51) observes that the weak links of evidence between victimization and fear and between fear and punitive attitudes indicate that it may be more important to study public perceptions of crime than objective measures of crime. Rather than taking the view that fear of crime is a response to rising crime, (Wilson, 1977, 1983:72-73), or to personal victimization, it is more evident that fear is stronger for some groups than actual victimization would account for. It does not seem that punitive attitudes rose because of concern for actual rising crime rates. (Stinchcombe et al., 1980:126).

Scheingold (1984:52) also addresses the weak relationship between fear of crime and punitiveness. He concludes that punitive attitudes toward crime are best understood by the way culture portrays crime and by personal reactions to it. He says, "...our reaction to these images, (cultural) depends on who we are and what we believe in."

Jacob (1984:20-21) examined public concern about crime in The Frustration of Policy: Responses to Crime by American Cities. He conducted a survey that evaluated the agendas of city administrations. The survey respondents ranked thirteen issues to obtain a measure of the importance of crime as a city problem. It was noted that crime did not become a primary focus of concern on agendas until the period of 1974 to 1978, when it reached the "number one

position." Until then, city agendas considered other matters more pressing, such as transportation, tax problems, and urban redevelopment. It may be that public concern about crime and the subsequent rise in punitive attitudes are not causally related, but are both influenced by other political and social factors.

The Breakdown of the Rehabilitative Model

Understanding the rise in public support for rehabilitative measures in the midst of the "get tough" movement requires a separate assessment of both the "decline of the rehabilitative ideal" and the increased support for "just deserts". Researchers have reviewed social events to assess their effect upon trends in public opinion. Beginning in the 1960's, the public's assumption that the state possessed the right to intervene (and interfere) in people's lives was challenged by civil rights groups. Rothman addresses this topic in his essay, "The state as parent: Social policy in the Progressive era." (In Gaylin, et al., 1978). Rothman observes that the Progressive era produced rehabilitative programs that were designed to "help" the needy and reform the wayward; but rehabilitative treatment and aid to the poor was found to be unfair and discriminatory. He asserts that the state should care for the dependent, but never with coercion or to the point of canceling their civil rights. But the state as the "caring parent" had been found to be "abusive and negligent." The state's benevolence was conditional: when assistance was accepted, it necessarily placed the receiver under the power and supervision of the giver. This exchange canceled the rights, privacy, and freedom of choice of those who received help from the government in any form. It was suspected that the government's programs were being used as a tool to control certain segments of society. This was the sentiment of many people who challenged the government's intentions in

the 1960's and 1970's. (1978:72).

Allen (1981) in his book, The Decline of the Rehabilitative Ideal, evaluates the loss of support for rehabilitation and the rise of retributive attitudes reflected in the "just deserts" model. He suggests that the suddenness, tenacity, and variations of the attacks on the rehabilitative ideal indicate that wider social and cultural influences must be involved. (Allen, 1981, Cullen & Gilbert, 1982, Glazer, 1984). Each attack originates from its source with its own motivations, assumptions and goals. (Allen, 1981:10). Rehabilitation was attacked when social factors influenced the public's feelings of alienation and sense of loss during the turmoil of the 1960's. During that time, the public became hostile and suspicious of governmental authority and benevolence. (Allen, 1981, Cullen & Gilbert, 1982, Glazer, 1984). Among the many factors contributing to this were the civil rights movement, widespread protest against the Vietnam War, the Watergate experience, and the claim of Marxists and black activists that criminal sanctions against them were "political oppression." (Allen, 1981:30, Glazer, 1984:134). These factors and events represent the breakdown of the public's feelings of security and purpose. They also represent the breakdown of the cultural atmosphere that is conducive to a successful rehabilitative effort.

Another factor that has been blamed for the "decline of rehabilitation" is the lack of confidence in the practice of psychological treatments both inside and outside the prison. (Allen, 1981:24). First, Allen asserts that society must believe that the criminal can be changed. Second, society must believe and have confidence in the institutions involved to produce the desired effect. (Allen, 1981:11, Glazer, 1984:134-5). This involves both the goals and means of reform. However, the public has experienced considerable

confusion over the goals of corrections and how to achieve them.

The assumption that the laws that offenders have broken are "just" or correct was "challenged by the New Left." (Glazer, 1984:134). Cultural influences from the turmoil of the 1960's were causing a re-evaluation of the basic rehabilitative premise that offenders were "sick" and in need of treatment. The ingredients necessary to effect a change in public policy toward crime and criminals were not only the conservative demand for change and tougher crime control, but also liberal reaction to the basic structure of society.

Civil rights groups scrutinized the justice system as well as government relief programs. The justice system was accused of being discriminatory and unfair. Court decisions that utilized rehabilitative practices were targeted. The indeterminant sentence and enforced therapy came to be viewed as the tool of repression of an unjust government that placed unnecessary power in the hands of the state. (Cullen & Gilbert, 1982:125). Because it has been claimed that there is little evidence to suggest that rehabilitation "works," (Martinson, 1974:25), and there is no way to adequately assess the point at which a person is rehabilitated, civil libertarians opposed the indeterminant sentence on the grounds of due process. Because the indeterminant sentence had been abused in some states, and criminologists were reporting that "nothing works", detention of an offender in prison until he/she was rehabilitated could not be tolerated or justified any longer. (Halleck & Witte, 1977:374, Cullen & Gilbert, 1982:122-127). Liberals demanded that limits be placed upon judicial discretion to avoid abuses of state power. The rehabilitationist's indeterminant sentence and enforced therapy is believed to give the government too much power

and opportunity for corruption. Similarly, Cullen and Gilbert (1982:125) affirm that mistrust of the government to deliver treatment for "curing" the criminal had waned for liberals in the 1970's. In citing the authors of Struggle for Justice, Cullen and Gilbert delineate liberal doubts. Liberals argued that rehabilitation is a "dangerous myth" and that it was merely a tool used by the state to victimize offenders.

It is true that there were problems with the treatment model. But Cullen and Gilbert (1982:125), explain that "the liberal solution to the problem of an unfair and discriminatory justice system is the justice model. Thus, the "rehabilitative ideal" was discarded as "the program for liberal reform." It was replaced by the justice model.

The Rise of "Just Deserts"

Halleck and Witte (1977:374) explain that, "The forces aligned against rehabilitation are formidable. They include not only traditional law-and-order groups but also prominent academicians, militants of the new left, zealous right-wing proponents of libertarianism, and prisoners themselves." The idea of "just deserts" is not new, but ancient, Allen (1981:66) points out, and was at the core of reformatory notions of the eighteenth century Enlightenment. He contends that the "just deserts" philosophy can be understood by two primary explanations. The first is that an offender's penalty is designed to punish. The second is that the penalty the offender receives should be in proportion to the offender's guilt. Additionally, he asserts that even though punishment may render some potential benefits, (such as deterring the offender from additional crime), punishment of the criminal does not need justification. Punishing criminal behavior is considered to be morally correct.

In regard to the retributive purpose of prison, Allen

explores the question of why retribution has gained favor in the last quarter of this century. He concludes that the trend of public favor for retribution over rehabilitation cannot be explained by the "wisdom of their arguments", (1981:10,32), or by the "persuasiveness of the logical cases arrayed against it." He explains that in times of insecurity, society "affirms morality" by assigning appropriate sanctions to lawbreakers and that "ideas of desert and penal proportion respond to basic concerns of people." In the 1960's, when "just deserts" began to gain support, the civil rights movement had caused every citizen to stop and recount his or her own values and beliefs. The movement contributed to a sense of confusion and fear of further social disorder. When society feels loss and alienation due to upheavals in societal values, it logically follows that society would "affirm morality" and social order. When society does this, it restores security in times of doubt and alienation. One avenue of affirmation is to deal harshly with those that threaten the social order. An examination of public opinion polls and criminological literature indicate that there has been a rise in support for retributive sanctions. (Allen, 1981:66, Cullen & Gilbert, 1982, Gottfredson & Taylor, 1984, Cullen, Clark, Cullen & Mathers, 1985, Cullen, Clark & Wozniak, 1985, Thomson & Ragona, 1987, Cullen, Cullen & Wozniak, 1988).

Deserved penalty for the crime is the basis of the justice model. No benefit or service that the state offers should keep the prisoner detained longer than the severity of the offense deserves. (Allen, 1981:67). The justice model apparently became popular because all forces joined in the attack against rehabilitation, albeit for different reasons. Liberals wanted an end to the rehabilitative model because rehabilitative treatment programs had not "worked." Civil libertarians were against rehabilitation and the

indeterminant sentence for reasons of due process and equality. They desired to place limitations on state power over prisoners. Prisoners opposed it because of their objection to coerced therapy and the tendency for indeterminate sentences to become disparate sentences. They opposed being detained in prison longer than their "just deserved" penalty. Scholars and legislators also wanted another alternative to rehabilitation but for their own reasons. Many of them believed that the public wanted one. Judicial discretion, used in the practice of the indeterminant sentence, was attacked on the premise that it placed unnecessary and excessive power and confidence in the judiciary. The determinant sentence was an alternative that placed a lid on judicial power, limiting the ability to treat or punish according to the offender's need. Instead, the justice model calls for the "punishment to fit the crime." Offenders should be punished according to the damage caused by their crimes. They were no longer treated individually according to rehabilitative need. "All offenders are equal before the law, and all receive their 'just deserts'---nothing more, nothing less." (Cullen & Gilbert, 1982:16). Cullen and Gilbert, however, wonder how those who distrusted the government to administer rehabilitative programs are now prepared to trust it to render "just deserts" equally to all. (1982:155).

The Crisis in Corrections

There has been a "crisis in corrections" as well as in society on matters pertaining to reform. The "crisis" can be illustrated by the change in California's statement of purpose of corrections. Before 1976, a California court stated that the goal of corrections was to "maximize rehabilitary efforts." But a new law in 1976 canceled that purpose. It states:

The Legislature finds and declares that the purpose

of imprisonment for crime is punishment: This purpose is best served by terms proportionate to the seriousness of the offense with provision for uniformity in the sentences of offenders committing the same offense under similar circumstances. (Allen, 1981:8).

The wording of the new law epitomizes the justice model. The 1976 law reflected that there was an attack upon rehabilitative practices such as the indeterminate sentence and "good time" credit in prisons. Also scrutinized were the practices of parole and the use of probation in serious criminal cases. Cullen and Gilbert (1982), in Reaffirming Rehabilitation, explain that the "just deserts" model replaced rehabilitation as the goal of corrections because both liberal and conservative camps believed that it was more promising. Gottfredson and Taylor (1984) assert that the "crisis in corrections" was caused by poor conditions in American prisons. Overcrowding, dilapidated buildings and a shortage of resources had caused a tremendous strain on the prison system. Additional causes of the crisis are the debate over the usefulness of correctional treatment programs, "confusion and disagreement" about the goals and objectives of corrections, and the benefits of rehabilitation versus punishment. (1984:190-191).

There has been a question in many scholars' minds however, of whether legislatures' policies reflect public sentiment. Thomson and Ragona (1987:377) claim that when legislative actions assigned greater punitive sanctions for certain crimes, they went far beyond public intentions and desires. Cullen, Cullen and Wozniak (1988:303) contend that the image of a 'punitive public' is mythological and it tends to obscure other policy considerations that state officials may have otherwise utilized. Even though researchers found that their sample was clearly punitive, it was also apparent that it strongly supported rehabilitative measures. The sample was not purely retributive or

punitive.

The Re-emergence of Support for Rehabilitation

When the "rehabilitative ideal declined", social scientists questioned whether the rise in punitive attitudes and support for harsh crime control policies meant that rehabilitation was no longer supported. Cullen, Cullen, and Wozniak (1988:304) stated that policymakers believe the public is "deeply punitive and has little use for traditional, liberal approaches to crime like rehabilitation." Much of the public, however, is clearly in favor of certain types of reform programs for certain types of offenders, such as voluntary education and work as therapy within prison and community-based corrections. In the studies mentioned in this chapter it was found that the public strongly supported punitive "get-tough," "lock-em-up" measures. But recently, studies have also revealed strong support for rehabilitative policies. Warr and Stafford (1984:102) polled Seattle residents in a study, utilizing mailed questionnaires. It was found that rehabilitation had fallen from first place in importance but it was still a highly preferred goal for criminal sanctions. Only one-fifth of the sample responded that rehabilitation was the most important goal of punishment, but 59 percent chose rehabilitation as one of the three most important goals of punishment. Retribution retained strong support. Warr and Stafford comment that, "our respondents are scarcely willing to abandon rehabilitation altogether."

In another important study, Cullen, Clark, and Wozniak (1985:16) analyzed several surveys conducted by the Sam Houston State University Criminal Justice Center between 1977 and 1982. They state that Texas was chosen for analysis "because it has a clear reputation as a 'law and order' state with a harsh prison system, and thus it should provide a good test case for assessing the consistency

between attitudes and policy." They concluded that Texans seem to be more punitive than the rest of the nation on measures of support for capital punishment, (ten to fifteen points higher), and in the belief that the courts are too lenient and too soft on crime, (three-fourths of those sampled). The authors conclude that Texans are punitive, but they do have a humanistic side." Texans are in favor of releasing inmates early when they are cooperative while in prison. (1985:19). Also noted in the study was that treatment in the 1981 survey ranked second as the "most preferred goal of imprisonment." In the 1982 survey, four-fifths of the respondents sampled supported the notion that rehabilitation is a 'very important' function of prisons. In the 1980 surveys, Texans were clearly punitive in their agreement that more prisons need to be built, but they also strongly endorsed the idea that non-violent offenders need community-based alternatives. Texans responded that they wanted incarcerated criminals to have access to programs that train offenders with the "interpersonal skills, knowledge, and training needed to avoid the trap of recidivism."

Cullen, Clark, Cullen, and Mathers (1985:318) surveyed the public in Galesburg, Illinois in 1982. The same questionnaire was used in Springfield, Illinois, in 1979, to survey a sample of criminal justice workers who were influential in criminal justice policy-making. Following the work of Stinchcombe, et.al., (1980), Cullen et.al. examined the possible effects of crime causal attribution, victimization and salience upon respondents' support of rehabilitation, punishment, capital punishment and punishment of white-collar crime. They found a negative relationship between support for rehabilitation and general punishment for those who favored a positivist view of criminality. No relationship was found between support of

criminal sanctions and victimization or salience. Several status variables were discovered to have an effect upon support for sanctions: older respondents were more punitive and less reformatory; female respondents were more reformatory and less punitive. Overall, the sample means indicated that punishment received more support ($\bar{X}=4.60$), but support for rehabilitation was also strong ($\bar{X}=4.12$). They concluded that "the appeal of rehabilitation, if tarnished, is still evident." (1985:324).

Another example of public support for reformatory measures is found in a study by Thomson and Ragona (1987:337,345) which surveyed residents in Illinois. They questioned the popular finding in the media and in certain public opinion polls that the public believes the courts are too lenient toward criminals. The questionnaire was constructed in such a way that respondents could choose between various sanctions for specific crimes with respect to the cost and purpose of implementing them. They concluded that the public is less vengeful than typically portrayed..." They noted that rehabilitation was not the primary public choice of the purpose of prisons any longer, but that it does still have strong general support. Further, they found that the public generally understands the purposes and uses of various sanctions. For instance, this sample recognized that probation and community service work may be more rehabilitative in some cases than a prison sentence.

Cullen, Cullen, and Wozniak's (1988:303) study attempted to answer the question, "*Is Rehabilitation Dead?*." They analyzed data from a survey of residents in Illinois. It was found that fifty-five percent of the sample agreed with the statement, "rehabilitating a criminal is just as important as making a criminal pay for his or her crime." The researchers concluded that although strong support for

punitive sanctioning was evident, "rehabilitation continues to retain substantial legitimacy."

Though support for rehabilitation and reformative programs have been expanding since the early 1980's, the types of programs supported have changed. In recent polls, it is revealed that the public clearly supports measures that are "tough on crime" but at the same time the public approves of positivistic alternatives and programs. Halleck and Witte (1977:378) comment that some of the programs of the past, such as the indeterminate sentence or enforced therapy, may never be utilized again. These practices placed prisoners completely at the discretion of the courts and parole boards. Halleck and Witte caution that the change the type of rehabilitative programs that the public desires should not be seen as a call to cancel all rehabilitative practices, but as a challenge to adjust them.

Flanagan and Caulfield (1987) examined the 1982 Gallup Survey to assess whether people believed that prisons should punish, simply detain prisoners or if they should do something more. The question posed was, "In dealing with men in prison, do you think it is more important to punish them for their crimes, or more important to get them started 'on the right road'?" Results of the survey yielded that 59 percent chose the latter solution and 30 percent chose the former. In this article, the authors assess an ABC News survey conducted in the same year which asked, "Do you think a prison should be mostly a place to punish criminals or mostly a place to teach criminals how to be useful, law-abiding citizens when they get out?" In this poll, results showed that 75 percent of the respondents preferred that prisons teach criminals and only 16 percent thought that prisons should be merely a punishment.

Correctional Support for Rehabilitation

A prison rehabilitation program could be undermined or

ruined if a consensus of support among prison staff is not present. If corrections staff are provided with a clear description of what their role is and if they are given the training to fulfill it, then there is no reason to believe that corrections officers would be "negative or obstructive to reform." (Hawkins, 1977:173). Research in recent years supports the notion that prison guards are not necessarily oriented toward custody or punitiveness. When goals and duties are clear and concise, correctional officers in large percentages support rehabilitative programs in prisons and rehabilitation centers. Additionally, correctional officers have expressed greater job satisfaction in surveys when they believe they are helping inmates to reform. (Hoffstetter, 1973, Crouch & Alpert, 1980, Hepburn & Albonetti, 1980, Poole & Regoli, 1980, Jurik, 1985, Bynum, Greene & Cullen, 1986, Cullen, Lutze, Link & Wolfe, 1989, Whitehead & Lindquist, 1989).

Pluralistic Ignorance

A lack of understanding of the opinions of co-workers, inmates and the public concerning correctional issues has been found in corrections and in the legislature. Several studies illustrate this "pluralistic ignorance." A study by Kauffman (1981:285) examined the extent to which correctional officers were aware of the attitudes of fellow officers. Kauffman administered a questionnaire to correctional officers at nine Connecticut prisons in order to study attitudes and awareness of other officers' attitudes toward inmates, custody and rehabilitative treatment. Kauffman found that officers underestimated the proportion of co-workers who expressed sympathetic, pro-inmate, and pro-treatment attitudes. Officers overestimated the proportion of anti-inmate attitudes.

Opinions of staff within the criminal justice system are not always apparent to legislators. Legislators should

not be "pluralistically ignorant", as Gottfredson and Taylor (1983:14) have advised. One example of what can happen when legislators are "pluralistically ignorant" occurred in the state of Maryland. Maryland legislators misread the public and discarded a reform package that was set to be implemented. The legislators did not realize that much of the public and many in the criminal justice system supported reform policies. In 1980, Gottfredson and Taylor surveyed the public and a sample from the criminal justice system and found that the "public and policy group can be characterized as rather liberal, non-punitive, utilitarian, and reform-oriented." Moreover, those in the criminal justice system who were surveyed "generally agreed that community-based alternatives were needed." (Gottfredson & Taylor, 1983:14). Additionally, legislators were surveyed on what they thought the public's opinion was toward reform policies. It was discovered that legislators as a group, thought that the public's attitude was almost the reverse of what the surveys revealed. Gottfredson and Taylor assert that in a democracy, policies that are utilized should be in concert with the opinions and desires of the public. They point out that the type of rehabilitative programs the public wanted were "increased localization of correctional programs and facilities."

Warr and Stafford (1984:96) show, however, that there are legislators and judicial officials who are aware of public opinion about criminal sanctions. Some seem to be "keenly sensitive to public goals of punishment." They illustrate this by drawing attention to the case of *Furman v. Georgia* (408 U.S. 238, 1972) and point out that the "opinions of the Supreme Court are replete with references to public goals of punishment."

Summary

As this review indicates, public opinion strongly

supports punishment as a primary purpose of criminal sanctioning. This ideology has been dominant in public opinion and has stabilized at a high level since the late 1970's. On the other hand, the "rehabilitative ideal" had "declined." (Allen, 1981, Flanagan & Caulfield, 1987). A reassessment of public attitudes on these issues has been the focus of recent research. The public holds both traditionally conservative, "get tough" attitudes and liberal reform ideas. It has been thought in the past that the public would hold to one or the other, but not both approaches. Stinchcombe (1980) examines Converse's cognitive consistency theory, in which Converse had asserted "that it is hard to hold very liberal and very punitive views at the same time." (Stinchcombe, et. al., 1980:7). The cognitive consistency theory would hold that the public would be either punitive or reformatory, but not both. The cognitive consistency theory is not supported when studies show strong public sentiment for punitive and reformatory approaches to the treatment of offenders.

Robison and Smith (1969:79-80) observed that the ideologies of punishment and treatment do not necessarily clash. That is, punishment and treatment "coexist" and are "not (necessarily) mutually exclusive." For others, punishment is the treatment, just as in the early days of the penitentiary. The entire rationale for incarcerating offenders was the idea and the hope that isolating offenders from the environment that produced their behavior would reform them. When the promised reform of the criminal did not materialize after "treatment" in the penitentiary, (i.e. working in silence in Philadelphia and/or isolation and religious exercises at Auburn), then the public seemed to rationalize the practice of incarceration. Punishment in the penitentiary became the "treatment." Incarceration was used to rehabilitate, reprogram and deter an offender from

further crime. (Rothman, 1971:79). Some believe that programs within the prison are considered to be the "treatment" and should be offered on a voluntary basis in order to equip the inmate with education, work skills and habits for his/her free life on the outside. Allen (1981:83) states that "during the course of the decade just past, a strong current of opinion has arisen calling for voluntarism in administration of education and rehabilitation." Cullen and Gilbert (1982:130) call for voluntary rehabilitation programs that help the prisoner change when he/she desires to change. It is maintained by some that punitive and liberal reform ideas do not necessarily exist "as an operative tension between poles, or as a single dimension or continuum." (Flanagan & Caulfield, 1987:32).

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This paper is an analysis of data derived from the (1988) Texas Crime Poll by the Criminal Justice Center at Sam Houston State University, at Huntsville, Texas.

Sample

For this Texas public opinion poll, 10,000 names were randomly selected from drivers license listings of the Department of Public Safety. Then, a random sample of 2,000 names was drawn from that listing and questionnaires were mailed in April, 1988. The survey polled residents aged seventeen and above. This survey used the general method developed by Dillman (1978) and adapted by the Sam Houston State University Survey Research Center. The Research Center utilized ten years of survey experience to refine the method. The return rate for their sample was 64 percent. Non-forwarded cases numbered 142 and six persons were deceased. The cases were not replaced. The analysis of the data includes information from 1182 usable returned questionnaires. The sample is approximately representative of the population in Texas and will not require weighting for analysis.

Independent Variables

Respondent characteristics for the sample will be treated as independent variables. The number of females included in the usable questionnaires is slightly disproportionate to the population as are numbers in the racial categories. Respondent characteristics that will be included in the analysis are sex, age, race, marital, voter registration, education level, annual income and the size of the town or city of respondents' residence. The variables age, race, education, income and size of the town or city of

residence will be recoded into condensed categories for analysis.

Question number 35 in the survey measures concern about crime. This variable will be treated as an independent variable. It will be analyzed in collapsed and raw forms for any effect upon dependent ratings of rehabilitation or punishment as the most important purpose of prison. The raw form is the open scale of zero to ten. The collapsed forms are the scales that will be divided into thirds to obtain "high", "medium" and "low" categories. The variable concern about crime was presented in the survey as the question, "What do you think your chances are of being a victim of any type of crime during the next year?" Collapsed and raw forms of this variable will be used in the analysis with raw and collapsed forms of rehabilitation and punishment as the dependent variables.

Dependent Variables

The dependent variables are the degree of support for rehabilitation or punishment as the most important purpose of prisons and will be compared to independent measures. These items will be analyzed as measures of punitiveness or reform orientation. In the survey questionnaire, the magnitude questions were arranged so that the respondent could rate each answer on a scale of zero to ten. The items were arranged under the heading, "The purpose of prisons. Prisons may serve a number of different purposes. How important should each of the following be for Texas prisons?" Items were presented with the instructions to rate each purpose according to its importance on a scale of zero to ten, (zero being not important and ten being most important). Rehabilitation was defined as "training and counseling to help criminals become law-abiding citizens." Punishment was defined as "making criminals pay for their crimes." These variables will be compared to each other to

determine if there is any relationship between them. These variables will be analyzed in the raw form (zero to ten scale) and will also be divided into three collapsed categories of "low", (zero to three), "medium", (four to six), and "high", (seven to ten). and into two groups with ranges of "low", (zero to five) and "high", (six to ten). The "high" category for both collapsed scales for rehabilitation will be considered a positivist, reformative attitude toward criminal sanctioning. Conversely, the "high" category for the punishment variable will be assumed to relate to classical or "just deserts" ideology.

The statistics tests that will be used in this study are the Pearson's r , to examine any relationship and its direction between variables, the t-test upon the means of groups for the variables representing support for rehabilitation and punishment to discover significant differences between them. The Chi Square statistic will be used to assess any contingencies, and Somer's D to examine the strength of any contingencies.

Limitations of the Study

This study analyzes secondary data. According to Kenneth Bailey (1987:295-297), research utilizing secondary data is problematic. One limitation is that the research goals of the present study may differ from those of the researchers who originally gathered the information. Another limitation is that any errors in the data being used for the present study cannot be detected. Therefore, the data collected by the researchers can only be assessed by taking them at face value.

Further, this study is limited in all the ways that data from self-report opinion questionnaires are limited. There is the presence of the possibility and tendency of respondents to "fake good" or "fake bad." (Anastasi, 1988:549-550). This may occur when the respondent desires

to gain favor from the researchers or to appear more socially acceptable. Thus, he or she responds to questions on the survey in a way that is not natural or honest. For example, if a respondent believes his/her answers about the purpose of prisons will be regarded as too harsh or too lenient, then the respondents may answer differently on a questionnaire than they would if asked their opinion by a friend.

The responses counted in the data set of the present analysis assumes that respondents answered honestly. There is always a risk present that some respondents will not, or that some are not mentally capable of doing so. Although, even when the respondent is being consciously honest, A.L. Edwards (in Anastasi, 1988:550) investigated the social desirability variable (SD) and defined it as a "facade effect or tendency to 'put up a good front' of which the respondent is largely unaware." This variable is explained as the respondent's effort to protect him/herself from criticism, and to appear more socially acceptable or to demonstrate social conformity. Expressed opinions about what should be done with criminals is subject to social judgments from others. This SD variable will no doubt represent some portion of the noise (or error variance), in the analysis of responses.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS

Introduction

In this chapter, hypotheses are tested and analyzed. Dependent measures of support for rehabilitation and punishment as most important purposes for prisons are tested for the effects of independent variables. Characteristics of respondents and concern about crime are used as independent variables. The findings of statistical tests are reported.

Sample Characteristics

The respondent characteristics for the sample are reported in Table 1. This table shows that the sample is fairly representative of the population from which it was drawn and does not require weighting for analysis. The similarity of the sample to the population is illustrated by the distributions of respondent characteristics of education and annual income level, race, marital status, voter registration, size of town or city of residence and age.

Distribution of Public Opinion Variables

The frequencies, percentages, means, medians, and modes of the raw scales of support for rehabilitation and punishment are presented in Table 2. This table reveals that most of the sample respondents felt strongly about rehabilitation as a most important purpose of prison. The mean of the scale for rehabilitation is 7.55. The number of respondents who chose number ten on the scale was 431, which was 36.5 percent, over one-third of the sample. This indicates that the sample strongly favors rehabilitation as an important purpose of prison. The mean of the punishment scale is 8.46, indicating that the sample also strongly endorses punishment as a very important purpose of prison.

TABLE 1
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR DEMOGRAPHIC
CHARACTERISTICS IN PERCENTAGES

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS	FREQUENCY	MEAN	PERCENTAGE
SEX			
Male	520		44.7
Female	643		55.3
MARITAL			
Married	831		71.7
Not Married	328		28.3
REGISTERED VOTER			
Yes	915		80.3
No	224		19.0
AGE			
		42.86	
1. 17-35	310		26.7
2. 36-55	515		44.4
3. 56+	334		28.8
RACE			
White	841		74.2
Black	114		10.1
Hispanic	178		15.7
EDUCATION			
		12.52	
1. Less Than High School	153		13.2
2. High School Grad or GED	317		27.3
3. Some College	365		31.4
4. College Degree (BS, BA)	220		18.9
5. Advanced College Degree	106		9.1
ANNUAL INCOME IN THOUSANDS			
		36.05	
1. 0-7K	83		7.0
2. 8-12K	92		7.8
3. 13-20K	156		13.2
4. 21-35K	268		22.7
5. 36-50K	237		20.1
6. 51-75K	120		10.2
7. 76+	69		5.8
SIZE OF CITY OR TOWN			
1. Small/Rural	265		23.9
2. City	335		30.2
3. Large City	511		46.0

TABLE 2

FREQUENCIES, PERCENTAGES, MEANS, MEDIAN, AND
MODES FOR RAW SCALES (0-10) OF SUPPORT FOR
REHABILITATION AND PUNISHMENT AS THE PURPOSE OF PRISONS

PURPOSE FOR PRISON		REHABILITATION		PUNISHMENT	
VALUE	FREQUENCY	%	FREQUENCY	%	
NOT IMPORTANT					
0	30	2.5	6	.5	
1	21	1.8	7	.6	
2	20	1.7	9	.8	
3	38	3.2	13	1.1	
4	34	2.9	26	2.2	
5	140	11.8	79	6.7	
6	63	5.3	52	4.4	
7	124	10.5	93	7.9	
8	175	14.8	179	15.1	
9	96	8.1	130	11.0	
10	431	36.5	581	49.2	
MOST IMPORTANT					
TOTAL	1172	99.2	1175	99.4	
	MEAN	MEDIAN	MODE		
REHABILITATION	7.55	8.0	10.0		
PUNISHMENT	8.46	9.0	10.0		
DIFFERENCE	-.91				

The number of respondents who chose number ten on the scale was 581, almost half of the sample.

Table 3 contains support for rehabilitation and punishment of the collapsed scales by thirds and halves. As the table reveals, most responses are found in the "high" categories for both of the collapsed rehabilitation and punishment scales. Percentages for both collapsed scales reveal that the "high" categories approximate each other. Rehabilitation received 69.9 percent support and punishment received 83.2 percent. The modes for both the categories of rehabilitation and punishment are equal.

Hypotheses

This study's first proposal stated that the sample will favor either rehabilitation or punishment. The percentages of support in Table 3 reveal that the sample strongly favors rehabilitation, (69.9 percent) and punishment, (83.2 percent). Rehabilitation and punishment as opinions are not mutually exclusive as the study proposed.

Hypothesis number 1 stated that the correlation between support for rehabilitation and punishment would be significant and negative. Pearson's r statistical test reveals that rehabilitation and punishment are not significantly correlated ($p > .05$). Table 4 shows the results of the Pearson's r test. Hypothesis 1 is not confirmed.

Hypothesis 2 stated that the means for the categories of support for rehabilitation and punishment would be significantly different. Two t -tests confirm this hypothesis. An independent random samples t -test conducted upon the means yields significance, ($t = -6.92$, $p < .000$), and a paired samples t -test found significance, ($t = -9.36$, $p < .000$). The results are shown in Table 4.

Hypothesis 3 stated that the means of the categories of support for punishment and rehabilitation would be meaningfully different, at least a distance of three points

TABLE 3

FREQUENCIES, PERCENTAGES, MEANS, MEDIANS AND MODES
FOR SUPPORT OF REHABILITATION AND PUNISHMENT
ON THE COLLAPSED SCALE BY THIRDS AND HALVES

PURPOSE FOR PRISON TRICHOTOMY

VALUE	REHABILITATION		PUNISHMENT	
	FREQUENCY	%	FREQUENCY	%
NOT IMPORTANT				
1 LOW	109	9.2	35	3.0
2 MEDIUM	237	20.1	157	13.3
3 HIGH	826	69.9	983	83.2
MOST IMPORTANT				
TOTAL	1172	99.2	1175	99.4
	MEAN		MEDIAN	MODE
REHABILITATION	2.66		3.0	3.0
PUNISHMENT	2.84		3.0	3.0
DIFFERENCE	.18		.0	.0

*Note- (0-3=1, low), (4-6=2, medium), (7-10=3, high)

PURPOSE FOR PRISON DICHOTOMY

VALUE	REHABILITATION		PUNISHMENT	
	FREQUENCY	%	FREQUENCY	%
NOT IMPORTANT				
1 LOW	283	23.9	140	11.8
2 HIGH	889	75.2	1035	87.6
MOST IMPORTANT				
TOTAL	1172	99.1	1175	99.4
	MEAN		MEDIAN	MODE
REHABILITATION	1.82		2.0	2.0
PUNISHMENT	1.92		2.0	2.0
DIFFERENCE	.10		.0	.0

*Note- (0-5=1, low), (6-10=2, high)

TABLE 4

INDEPENDENT RANDOM GROUPS, PAIRED SAMPLES T-TESTS,
AND CORRELATIONS FOR REHABILITATION AND PUNISHMENT SCALES

INDEPENDENT RANDOM GROUPS

VARIABLE	#CASES	MEAN	SE	t	DF	P
GROUP 1						
REHABILITATION	590	7.55	.111	-6.92*	1173	.000
GROUP 2						
<u>PUNISHMENT</u>	<u>585</u>	<u>8.46</u>	<u>.085</u>			

*Pooled Variance Test

*Note- this test compares distributions by dividing the respondents randomly into two groups and then assigning rehabilitation and punishment to the two groups.

PAIRED SAMPLES

VARIABLE	#CASES	MEAN	SE	T	DF	P
REHABILITATION	1169	7.55	.078	-9.36	1168	.000
<u>PUNISHMENT</u>	<u>1169</u>	<u>8.46</u>	<u>.060</u>			

r=.0075

p=.399

*Note-this paired samples test assumes related samples.

between the means. This hypothesis is not confirmed. The difference between the means is less than one point, ($8.46 - 7.55 = .91$), as revealed by a simple subtraction test. This is illustrated in Table 2.

This study's second proposal stated that the sample would be more punitive than rehabilitative. This proposal is supported by the percentage of support for punishment shown in Table 3. Most respondents in the sample favor punishment as a most important purpose of prison. The sample is more punitive than rehabilitative.

Hypothesis 4 stated that the mean for the category of support for punishment would be significantly higher for punishment than for rehabilitation. The mean for punishment is significantly higher, 8.46, than for rehabilitation, 7.55. Hypothesis 4 is confirmed.

Hypothesis 5 stated that the mean for punishment would be meaningfully higher than the mean for rehabilitation. This hypothesis is not confirmed. The difference between the means is not at least three points, it is less than one point.

Hypothesis number 6 stated that when responses for support of punishment and rehabilitation are grouped into thirds, the groups will reveal a tendency to be at opposite ends (i.e., low-high, high-low) or together in the middle (medium-medium). That is, respondents will demonstrate a tendency to choose either rehabilitation or punishment as the most important purpose of prison. Table number 6 shows that most responses were found in the "high-high" category on the contingency table. The groups demonstrated a tendency to cluster together, not to be found at opposite ends. The hypothesis is not confirmed.

Hypothesis 7 stated that when the scales are collapsed by thirds, the low-high, high-low and medium-medium groupings would represent more than 50 percent of all cases.

TABLE 5

CROSSTABULATION OF SUPPORT FOR REHABILITATION
BY PUNISHMENT COLLAPSED BY THIRDS

<u>Punishment-></u>	Count		<u>LOW</u>	<u>MEDIUM</u>	<u>HIGH</u>	Row
	Row Pct	Col Pct				
	Tot Pct	1	2	3	Total	
<u>Rehabilitation</u>	1	5	8	96	109	
		4.6	7.3	88.1	9.3	
LOW		14.3	5.1	9.8		
		.4	.7	8.2		
	2	3	35	199	237	
MEDIUM		1.3	14.8	84.0	20.3	
		8.6	22.3	20.4		
		.3	3.0	17.0		
	3	27	114	682	823	
HIGH		3.3	13.9	82.9	70.4	
		77.1	72.6	69.8		
		2.3	9.8	58.3		
	Column Total	35	157	977	1169	
		3.0	13.4	83.6	100.0	
Chi Square	DF	Significance				
7.26712	4	.1224				

TABLE 6

CROSSTABULATION OF SUPPORT FOR REHABILITATION
BY PUNISHMENT COLLAPSED BY HALVES

	Count			
	Row Pct	LOW	HIGH	
<u>Punishment-></u>	Col Pct			Row
	<u>Tot Pct</u>	1	2	<u>Total</u>
<u>Rehabilitation</u>				
	1	35	248	283
LOW		12.4	87.6	24.2
		25.0	24.1	
		<u>3.0</u>	<u>21.2</u>	
	2	105	781	886
HIGH		11.9	88.1	75.8
		75.0	75.9	
		<u>9.0</u>	<u>66.8</u>	
	Column	140	1029	1169
	Total	12.0	88.0	100.0
	<u>Chi Square</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>Significance</u>	
	.01634	1	.8983	

This hypothesis is not confirmed since 58.3 percent of all cases are found in the "high-high" category, indicating that almost 60 percent of all cases strongly support both rehabilitation and punishment as a most important purpose of prison. Chi Square is not significant ($X^2=7.26712$, $p>.05$).

Hypothesis 8 stated that when the scales for punishment and rehabilitation are collapsed into halves, the groups will tend to be at opposite ends and will represent more than 50 percent of all cases. These hypotheses are not confirmed as Table 6 shows. Most responses, 66.8 percent, are grouped in the "high-high" category.

Demographic Variables

The frequencies, percentages, Chi Square, and Somer's D statistics for categories of the variables rehabilitation and punishment collapsed into thirds by demographic characteristics are presented in Table 7. This table shows that support for rehabilitation and punishment as the most important purposes of prisons is high across all demographic groups.

Sex

Analysis of data revealed that sex affected support for rehabilitation. Table 7 reveals that females are more likely to support rehabilitation than males. A Chi Square analysis revealed significance ($X^2=10.32$, $p<.006$). The Somer's D statistic demonstrated that sex explains approximately eight percent of the variance for rehabilitation ($D=-.082$). A significant relationship is also found between sex and punishment when the scale was collapsed by thirds. Females reported higher levels of support for punishment than males. A Chi Square and Somer's D analysis yielded significance ($X^2=14.56$, $p<.0007$, $D=-.028$).

Race

The effect of race upon support for rehabilitation is

TABLE 7

REHABILITATION AND PUNISHMENT BY
DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS COLLAPSED BY THIRDS

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC		REHABILITATION			PUNISHMENT		
		HIGH	MED	LOW	HIGH	MED	LOW
SEX							
Male	N	344	112	62	430	64	26
	%	66.4	21.6	12.0	82.7	12.3	5.0
Female		474	122	46	546	89	8
		73.8	19.0	7.2	84.9	13.8	1.2
		Y ² =10.32 p=.006			X ² =14.56 p=.0007		
		D=-.082			D=-.028		
MARITAL							
Married		582	169	77	702	105	24
		70.3	20.4	9.3	76.0	13	2.8
Not Married		236	63	29	269	50	10
		72.0	19.2	8.8	82.0	15.0	.3
		X ² = n/s*			X ² = n/s		
VOTER							
Yes		648	185	79	770	121	24
		71.1	20.3	8.7	84.2	13.2	2.6
No		180	34	10	155	42	27
		69.2	18.8	12.1	80.4	15.2	4.5
		X ² = n/s			X ² = n/s		
AGE							
1. 17-35		202	72	35	265	35	10
		65.4	23.3	11.3	85.5	11.3	3.2
2. 36-55		371	103	39	421	79	15
		72.3	20.1	7.6	81.7	15.3	2.9
3. 56+		241	59	34	285	40	9
		72.2	17.7	10.2	85.3	12.0	2.7
		X ² = n/s			X ² =n/s		
RACE							
White		576	188	75	694	122	25
		68.7	22.4	8.9	82.5	14.5	3.0
Black		94	11	9	100	14	0
		82.5	9.6	7.9	87.7	12.3	0
Hispanic		130	31	16	155	14	9
		73.4	17.5	9.0	87.1	7.9	5.1
		X ² =11.90 p=.018			X ² =11.52 p=<.05		
		D=.065			D=.042		

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	REHABILITATION			PUNISHMENT		
	HIGH	MED	LOW	HIGH	MED	LOW
EDUCATION						
1. Less Than High School	100 65.4	36 23.5	17 11.1	127 83.0	20 13.1	6 3.9
2. High School Grad or GED	229 72.5	59 18.7	28 8.9	280 88.3	32 10.1	5 1.6
3. Some College	257 70.8	77 21.2	29 8.0	313 85.8	44 12.1	8 2.2
4. College Degree (BS,BA)	153 69.5	40 18.2	27 12.3	178 80.9	35 15.9	7 3.2
5. Advanced College Degree	78 73.6	21 19.8	7 6.6	75 70.8	23 21.7	8 7.5
$X^2=n/s$			$X^2=23.91$ $p=.0024*$ $D=-.04848$			
ANNUAL INCOME IN THOUSANDS						
1. 0-7K	54 65.1	24 28.9	5 6.0	62 74.7	19 22.9	2 2.4
2. 8-12K	68 73.9	18 19.6	6 6.5	77 84.6	10 11.0	4 4.4
3. 13-20K	115 74.2	32 20.6	8 5.2	135 87.1	14 9.0	6 3.9
4. 21-35K	187 70.8	51 19.3	26 9.8	223 83.8	40 15.0	3 1.1
5. 36-50K	161 68.5	43 18.3	31 13.2	196 83.1	27 11.4	13 5.5
6. 51-75K	76 63.3	32 26.7	12 10.0	101 84.2	17 14.2	2 1.7
7. 76+	54 78.3	10 14.5	5 7.2	59 85.5	9 13.0	1 1.4
$X^2=n/s$			$X^2=n/s$			
SIZE OF CITY OR TOWN						
1. Small/Rural	180 67.9	55 20.8	30 11.3	234 88.3	26 9.8	5 1.9
2. City	225 67.4	78 23.4	31 9.3	275 82.1	49 14.6	11 3.3
3. Large City	378 74.1	88 17.3	44 8.6	421 82.4	72 14.1	18 3.5
$X^2=n/s$			$X^2=n/s$			

*Note- n/s indicates not significant @ .05 level.

significant when the data were collapsed into categories by thirds ($X^2=13.174$, $p<.05$, $D=.069$). Table 7 shows that blacks are stronger in their support for rehabilitation than the white and Hispanic race categories (82.3% v. 68.7%, 73.1%). The Hispanic race category is stronger in their support of rehabilitation than whites.

The relationship between race and punishment collapsed by thirds is also significant ($X^2=14.102$, $p<.05$, $D=.042$), and is an explanation for about five percent of the variance. Black respondents were stronger in their support for punishment than were whites, (87.7% v. 82.5%).

Education

The results of the Chi Square and Somer's D statistical tests indicated a significant relationship between education and punishment ($X^2=23.91$, $p<.0024$, $D=-.04848$). According to Table 7, respondents' education is an explanation of only about one-half of a percent of the variance. Most of the "high" support is found in the "high school" category (88.3%).

An analysis was conducted upon the variables of respondents' income level, marital and voting status, age, and the size of town or city of residence. No significant effect of these variables was discovered upon dependent measures of support for rehabilitation and punishment.

Concern About Crime as an Exogenous Variable

Table 8 shows the frequencies for concern about crime for the raw scale and the scale collapsed by thirds. Table 9 shows that the analysis of the rehabilitation scale and the concern about crime scale collapsed into thirds yielded significant results ($X^2=11.98$, $p<.01$, $D=.0438$). Support for punishment revealed a significant relationship with concern about crime. When the categories were collapsed into thirds, Chi Square and Somer's D revealed significance, ($X^2=11.17$, $p<.02$, $D=.0460$). A partial regression

TABLE 8

CONCERN ABOUT CRIME
RAW AND COLLAPSED SCALES FREQUENCIES

RAW SCALE FREQUENCIES
CHANCES YOU BECOME A CRIME VICTIM IN THE NEXT YEAR

		CONCERN ABOUT CRIME	
	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
NO CHANCE	0	48	4.1
	1	62	5.2
	2	82	6.9
	3	117	9.9
	4	64	5.4
	5	313	26.5
	6	88	7.4
	7	118	10.0
BIGGEST PROBLEM	8	126	10.7
	9	47	4.0
	10	95	8.0
TOTAL		1160	98.1

SCALE FREQUENCIES COLLAPSED BY THIRDS
CONCERN ABOUT CRIME

	N %	VALUE	
NO CHANCE		0-3	1 309 26.1
		4-6	2 465 39.3
BIGGEST PROBLEM		7-10	3 386 32.7
TOTAL			1160 98.1

TABLE 9

CROSSTABULATION OF CONCERN ABOUT CRIME BY
REHABILITATION AND PUNISHMENT
COLLAPSED CATEGORIES BY THIRDS

<u>CONCERN ABOUT CRIME</u>					
	N	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOTAL
<u>REHABILITATION</u>	%				
LOW		28	41	39	108
		2.4	3.6	3.4	9.4
MED		83	82	70	235
		7.2	7.1	6.1	20.4
HIGH		196	340	271	807
		17.0	29.6	23.6	70.2
TOTAL		307	463	380	1150
		26.7	40.3	33.0	100.0
<u>PUNISHMENT</u>					
LOW		16	11	7	34
		1.4	1.0	.6	2.9
MED		50	58	47	155
		4.3	5.0	4.1	13.4
HIGH		242	395	328	965
		21.0	34.2	28.4	83.6
		308	464	382	1154
		26.7	40.2	33.1	100.0
	CHI SQUARE		p	D	
REHABILITATION	11.98		<.01	.0438	
PUNISHMENT	11.17		<.02	.0460	

correlation test was performed on the scales for rehabilitation and punishment which controlled for concern about crime. This test was not significant ($p > .05$), indicating that when concern about crime is controlled, punishment and rehabilitation are not correlated.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The proposition that the categories of support for rehabilitation and punishment would be mutually exclusive is not supported in this study. The hypothesis that respondents who strongly support punishment would not also strongly support rehabilitation is not confirmed. Respondents strongly supported both purposes for prisons. The categories are not mutually exclusive in this sample.

The findings confirm the hypothesis that the means for rehabilitation and punishment will be significantly different. But the results also indicate that the means are not meaningfully different as defined by a difference of at least three points between the means. The levels of support for both punishment and rehabilitation purposes for prison are high. In the contingency tables, support is shown to be in high ranges for both. It must be concluded that the means are not meaningfully different.

The hypothesis that rehabilitation and punishment would be significantly and negatively correlated is also not supported. The proposition that the sample will be more punitive than rehabilitative is confirmed, since the category for punishment received the strongest support. The hypothesis that the mean for punishment would be significantly higher than the mean for rehabilitation is also confirmed. This sample of Texans is shown, as expected, to be punitive in their approach to the treatment of offenders.

The analysis of this survey confirms the findings of recent research that evaluates public opinion on the purposes of prisons. This study finds that the public is supportive of both, not either punishment or rehabilitation.

These conclusions add to the heuristic discovery that the public is both "tough on crime" and reformatory at the same time. Results of statistical tests show that rehabilitation has a level of support at nearly 70 percent, and punishment approximates 85 percent. Apparently, this sample does not recognize a conflict between these choices for the purpose of prisons. The open scale used in this study made this discovery possible. If a forced choice instrument had been used, this finding would have been obscured. The respondents would have had to choose between rehabilitation and punishment as the purpose of prison. Reformatory attitudes would probably have been masked since respondents showed stronger support for punishment. If they had to choose between the two purposes, punishment probably would have been chosen. The sample is clearly more punitive than rehabilitative.

As noted earlier, Cullen, et. al. (1985:20) came to a similar conclusion in their study. They also found that a majority of their sample regarded both rehabilitation and punishment as very important functions of prison.

Status Variables

The finding that females' support for rehabilitation is significantly higher than males' is consistent with the findings of Cullen, et. al. (1988: 316, note 10). The earlier study also found that respondent characteristics influenced support for certain goals in criminal sanctioning. They discovered that females were more supportive of rehabilitation. But contrary to their results that age was negatively related to rehabilitation items, this study found no significant relationship between age and rehabilitative support, although support for reform was greater in the thirty-six-year-old and above category.

Concern About Crime

The results of this study demonstrate that respondents

are not in a panic about crime. Most of the respondents' beliefs were scored in the mid-range. Hence, concern about crime (v35) does not contribute to an explanation of the high levels of punitiveness found in this sample. This finding agrees with the results of the study by Cullen, et. al. (1985:17-18), "Explaining the Get Tough Movement," which revealed that a majority of Texans from their sample "felt completely safe in their homes and that only a small minority were afraid on a regular basis." In the present study, the concern about crime categories were about evenly split within the three ranges of high, medium and low. The majority of respondents in the Cullen, et. al. 1985 study were not overly afraid or fearful of being victimized, as it was found in the present study. In the 1982 survey, 54 percent of the Texas residents responded that they "never felt afraid of being alone at night in their home" and only 23 percent were "afraid to walk alone at night within one block of home." However as might be expected, the sample was wary of walking within a mile of home alone. Although they reported that they took certain measures to protect themselves, (e.g. securing their homes or buying a gun), they revealed that they were not afraid to "walk within a mile of their homes if accompanied by a friend," (72%) or to take walks "with a friend within a block of home" (91%).

Similarly, a 1989 Gallup report revealed that 43 percent of the respondents were "afraid to walk alone at night, although walking with a friend is not assessed, nor is the distance specified. The score for those who answered "yes" or "no" to feeling "unsafe at home" was ten percent. This score was six percentage points below the 1983 scores. Fear of crime actually decreased in that report (Gallup, 1989:8).

Rehabilitation or Punishment

The findings of this study agree with those of

Gottfredson and Taylor (1983) since they found strong support for "get tough" sanctions and also for reformative solutions. The present study's results additionally confirm those of Thomson and Ragona (1987) who found a strong "residual support" for rehabilitative programs. Similarly, these results agree with those of Cullen, Clark, Cullen and Mathers (1985) who found that their sample strongly supported both reform and punitive sanctions.

The finding of public support for both "lock-em-up" strategies and reformative measures is clear, but the reasons for this shift in opinion is much less evident. Formerly, the public's opinions about rehabilitation and punishment had been assumed to be dichotomous. The central limitation of this study is that there is no indication of causal links between support for purposes of prisons and any other variable analyzed. Since it has been fairly well established that cultural and psycho-social factors play a part in setting the stage for public opinion (Allen, 1981), it is assumed that these factors also contribute to alterations in those opinions. In order to discover the reasons for the changes, further research should be conducted upon attitudes with a focus upon cultural, psycho-social events. Also, the influence that the criminal justice system exerts should be examined closely. It could be that the public realizes that punitive treatment of offenders alone is not "working". Perhaps they believe that the rise in crime is an indication of that. They may believe that more needs to be done with prisoners other than just punishing them.

The issue of whether prison can rehabilitate people and prevent them from committing subsequent crime when released is complex. Public support is strong for the notion that prison can change people. Recent research, however, has shown that legal sanctions explain only part of the reason

for not committing crime. Informal social control mechanisms explain more of the variance in one study where Williams (1985), "rethinks" the relationship between legal sanctions and offending. Williams' study is an analysis of data from a random sample survey of licensed Texas drivers. Results reveal that a measure of deterrence presented by legal sanctions for the use of marijuana, accounts for less than half of the variance of reasons given for non-use. More than half of the variance is explained by informal social control factors such as "significant-other pressure" and "pressure of family" and "pressure of friends." Williams' study evaluated the type of sanction that prevented respondents from offending. Informal social control mechanisms were found to be of more influence than formal or legal controls in this sample. This finding might be an indication that respondents were not conscious of the factors that keep them from offending. Legal sanctions are only partially explanatory.

Punishment applied to offenders, by itself, without support from "significant others" and programs that fit the criminal will probably "not work." Sechrest (1989:19-20) comments that "most experts agree that without the help of the family, and without addressing social problems emanating from poor schools, unemployment, poverty and racial discrimination, there is little likelihood that the "scare" (of shock incarceration programs) will last for any length of time." He suggests that if programs are "properly used and evaluated," certain programs "may be successful for some types of inmates."

Although the public strongly supports punishment and rehabilitation as important purposes of prisons, there is evidence that prison may not in fact, change criminals, no matter what is done with them inside the walls. A time series analysis by Bowker (1981) concluded that

incarceration may be criminogenic. In other words, incarceration engenders crime. The study compared crime rate data (FBI Uniform Crime Reports), with incarceration rates for the years 1941 to 1957, and 1958 to 1978. A significant positive relationship was discovered when a three-year time lag was used. As the incarceration rate rose, the crime rate also increased to a comparable level. Although the reason for the rate's fluctuations are not readily obvious, there may be evidence to suggest that incarceration is counterproductive to changing criminals. Yet the public persists in supporting punishment and rehabilitation as important goals of prisons to effect change of the criminal. Another explanation offered by Bowker is that other factors influence both the crime rate and incarceration rates. As Williams (1985), has suggested, informal societal pressure may account for any decreases observed in the crime rate. Factors such as overcrowding in the prisons may influence the incarceration rate more than the crime rate does.

It is evident that those purposes of prisons that the public supported had changed in the 1970's and early 1980's. A study of the Harris National Survey for the years 1967, 1970, 1978, 1981 and 1982, by Flanagan and Caulfield (1987:35), reveal that public support for rehabilitation had declined over those years. The Harris Survey differentiated between what the respondents thought the emphasis of prisons was and what they felt it should be. This study effectively taps yet another aspect of public attitudes toward the concept of punishment. The respondents in this sample felt that the goals of prisons should include an increased emphasis on societal protection. The authors explain...

The percentage of respondents favoring rehabilitation was 72 percent in 1967, 73 percent in 1970, 48 percent in 1981, and 44 percent in 1982. ...Punishment increased between 1970 and 1978, but it

has since decreased. The most clearly discernible shift in attitudes over the five surveys appears to be away from rehabilitation as the desired emphasis of prisons, in favor of increasing emphasis on societal protection. (1987: 35).

One of the most important points to make here is that the way a question is worded and the manner and context in which a concept is presented will constitute much of the variance in surveys. Therefore, research that compares different surveys should be conducted with care. (Dillman 1978 in Flanagan and Caulfield, 1987: 31).

Alternatively, it is possible that the argument presented in Warr and Stafford (1984:96) is a better explanation. Perhaps the public is misunderstanding the concept of punishment and rehabilitation. That is, that "the public does not comprehend, much less subscribe to, particular philosophies of punishment." Allen (1981:10,32) would probably agree, since he pointed out that public preference for retribution over rehabilitation in the 1970's "cannot be explained by the wisdom of their arguments ...or by the persuasiveness of the logical cases arrayed against it."

Another way of explaining this sample's strong support for both rehabilitation and punishment is that the issue of what to do with criminals is decided by individuals more on an emotional level than a logical one. For example, some people who are staunch advocates of the pro-life movement also favor the government's use of the Death Penalty. To be a supporter of both seems illogical and it should be concluded that it is. But people do not consistently base their opinions upon logic. The same explanation could be applied to the problem of public support for both rehabilitation and punishment. Though these may be conflicting ideologies, the public is supportive of both.

Results of the present study reveal that although rehabilitation is not the first priority, it is still a

viable purpose of imprisonment. When the scales for support of rehabilitation and punishment were collapsed into a dichotomy and compared using a crosstabulation, nearly 70 percent of the sample responded with "high" support for rehabilitation and punishment. When the scales were collapsed into a trichotomy in the same manner, a full 59 percent chose the "high" category for rehabilitation and punishment. These findings are similar to those of Warr and Stafford (1984:102) who found that 59 percent of their sample supported rehabilitation as one of the three most important goals for prisons. They concluded that their sample was "scarcely willing to abandon rehabilitation altogether."

Results of the present study show that overall, respondents strongly favor punishment (83.2%) but they also support the rehabilitation of incarcerated offenders (69.9%). The priority for dealing with criminals seems to be punishment, but rehabilitation occupies a strong second place.

In the present study, it is probably not beneficial to examine respondent characteristics for their effect upon rehabilitation and punishment since the sample strongly favors both approaches. The outcome of such analysis may simply reflect the differences between status variables within the sample. Therefore, other factors that contribute to support must be discovered. Perhaps protection of the community has become the impetus for high levels of support for punishment. The public strongly supports punishment for offenders, but once the person is incarcerated, the public is in favor of rehabilitation. Why the high levels of punitiveness? Status variables and concern about crime do not explain it. The present study does not answer the question adequately. Further research is necessary to clarify this issue.

The information obtained from the present study, that the public favors using rehabilitative programs in prison, should be attended to by policymakers and prison administrators. They should adjust prison programs to accommodate public reformatory attitudes. The change in public sentiment should be considered in making policy for the operations of prisons. Prison administrators should be aware of public sentiment regarding objectives for prisons. They should focus upon rehabilitative programs, refine them and make them more available to prisoners within the walls.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, F. A. (1981). The decline of the rehabilitative ideal. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Anastasi, A. (1988). Psychological testing (6th ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Back, K. W. (1988). Metaphors for public opinion in literature. Public Opinion Quarterly, 52(3):278-288.
- Bailey, K. D. (1987). Methods of social research (3rd ed.). New York: The Free Press, a Division of Macmillan, Inc.
- Bowker, Lee H. (1981). Crime and the use of prisons in the United States: A time series analysis. Crime and Delinquency, 27(2):206-212.
- Bynum, T. S., Green, J. R., & Cullen, F. T. (1986). Correlates of legislative crime control ideology. Criminal Justice Policy Review, 1(3):253-265.
- Coleman, J. C., Butcher, J. N., & Carson, R. C. (1984). Abnormal psychology and modern life (7th ed.). Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Converse, P. E. (1987). Changing conceptions of public opinion in the political process. Public Opinion Quarterly, 51(4):S12-S24.
- Crouch, B. M., & Alpert, G. P. (1980). Prison guards' attitudes toward components of the criminal justice system. Criminology, 18(2):227-236.
- Cullen, F. T., & Gilbert, K. E. (1982). Reaffirming rehabilitation. Cincinnati: Andersen.
- , Clark, G. A., Cullen, J. B., & Mathers, R. A. (1985, September). Attribution, salience, and attitudes toward criminal sanctioning. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 12(3):305-331.
- , Clark, G. A., & Wozniak, J. F. (1985). Explaining the get tough movement: Can the public be blamed? Federal Probation, 49:16-24.
- , Link, B. G., Travis, L. F., III, Wozniak, J. F. (1985). Consensus in crime seriousness: Empirical

reality or methodological artifact? Criminology, 23:
99-117.

-----, Cullen, J. B., & Wozniak, J. F. (1988). Is
rehabilitation dead? The myth of the punitive public.
Journal of Criminal Justice, 16:303-317.

-----, Lutze, F. E. Link, B. G., & Wolfe, N. T. (1989).
The correctional orientation of prison guards: Do
officers support rehabilitation? Federal Probation,
53(1):33-41.

-----, Skovron, S. E., Scott, J. E., & Burton, V. S., Jr.
(1990). Public support for correctional treatment, the
tenacity of rehabilitative ideology. Criminal Justice
and Behavior, 17(1):6-18.

Currie, E. (1985). Confronting crime: An American
challenge. New York: Pantheon Books.

Flanagan, T. J. (1987). Change and influence in popular
criminology: Public attributions of crime causation.
Journal of Criminal Justice, 15(3):321-343.

-----, & Caulfield, S. L. (1987). Public opinion and
prison policy: A review. Crime and Delinquency, 33(2):
337-357.

Fogel, D. (1975). We are the living proof: The justice
model for corrections. Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson
Publishing Company.

Gallup. (1989). The Gallup report (No. 280-5). Princeton,
N.J.: The Gallup Poll.

Gaylin, W., Glasser, I., Marcus, S., & Rothman, D. J.
(1978). Doing good: The limits of benevolence. New
York: Pantheon Books.

Glasser, I. (1978). Prisoners of benevolence. In W.
Gaylin, et al., Doing good: The limits of benevolence.
New York: Pantheon Books.

Glazer, N. (1984). The public interest on crime and
punishment. New York: University Press of America.

Glynn, C. J., & McLeod, J. (1984). Public opinion du jour:
An examination of the spiral of silence. Public Opinion
Quarterly, 48(4):731-740.

Gottfredson, S. D., & Taylor, R. B. (1983). The

correctional crisis: Prison populations and public policy. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

-----, (1984). Public policy and prison population. Judicature, 68:190-201.

Halleck, S. L., & Witte, A. D. (1977). Is rehabilitation dead? Crime and Delinquency, 23:372-382.

Hawkins, G. (1976). The prison: Policy and practice. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hepburn, J. R., & Albonetti, C. (1980). Role conflict in correctional institutions: An empirical examination of the treatment-custody dilemma among correctional staff. Criminology, 17:445-459.

Hoffstetter, W. (1973). Practical considerations on prison administration of treatment programs. (53-56). In Scott, E. (1973). Criminal rehabilitation: Within and without the walls. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.

Humphries, D. (1981). Serious crime, news coverage in a Metropolitan paper. Crime and Delinquency, 27(2):191-205.

Jacob, H. (1984). The frustration of policy: Responses to crime by American cities. Boston: Little Brown & Company.

Jamieson, K. M., & Flanagan, T. J. (Eds.). (1988). Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Jurik, N. C. (1985). Individual and organizational determinants of correctional officer attitudes toward inmates. Criminology, 23(3):523-539.

Kauffman, K. (1981). Prison officers' attitudes and perceptions of attitudes: A case of pluralistic ignorance. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 18:272-294.

Martinson, R. (1974). What works?-Questions and answers about prison reform. Public Interest, (Spring):22-54.

McGuigan, F.J. (1983). Experimental psychology: Methods of research (4th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Noelle-Neuman, E. (1974). The spiral of silence: A theory

of public opinion. Journal of Communication, 24(2):43-51.

Poole, E. D., & Regoli, R. M. (1980). Role stress, custody orientation, and disciplinary actions. Criminology, 18(2):215-226.

Price, W. (1989). Social identification and public opinion: Effects of communicating group conflict. Public Opinion Quarterly, 53(2):197-224.

Robinson, J. P., & Levy, M. R. (1986). Interpersonal communication and news comprehension. Public Opinion Quarterly, 50(2):160-175.

Robison, J., & Smith, G. (1971). The effectiveness of correctional programs. Crime and Delinquency, January: 67-80.

Rogers, J. W. (1989). The greatest correctional myth: Winning the war on crime through incarceration. Federal Probation, 53(3):21-28.

Rothman, D. R. (1971). The discovery of the asylum: social order and disorder in the new republic. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

----- (1980). Conscience and Convenience. Boston: Little Brown and Company.

Scheingold, S. (1984). The politics of law and order: Street crime and public policy. New York: Longman.

Scott, E. M., & Scott, K. L. (1973). Criminal rehabilitation: Within and without the walls. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.

Sechrest, D., & Reimer, E. (1989). Adopting national standards for correctional reform. Federal Probation, 53(2):18-25.

----- (1989). Prison "Boot Camps" do not measure up. Federal Probation, 53(3):15-20.

Stinchcombe, A. L., Adams, R., Heimer, C. A., Scheppele, K. L., Smith, T. W., & Taylor, D. G. (1980). Crime and punishment-changing attitudes in America. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Thomson, D. R., & Ragona, A. J. (1987). Popular moderation versus governmental authoritarianism: an

- interactionist view of public sentiments toward criminal sanctions. Crime and Delinquency, 33(2):337-357.
- Warr, M., & Stafford, M. (1984). Public goals of punishment and support for the death penalty. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 21(2):95-111.
- Whitehead, J. T., & Lindquist, C. A. (1989). Determinants of correctional officer professional orientation. Justice Quarterly, 6:69-87.
- Williams, F. P., III. (1985). Deterrence and social control: Rethinking the relationship. Journal of Criminal Justice, 13:141-151.
- Wilson, J. Q. (1983). Thinking about crime. New York: Basic Books.